

NOTICE: THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT
AND MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE
RULES. See Ariz. R. Supreme Court 111(c); ARCAP 28(c); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24.

FILED BY CLERK

MAY 19 2008

COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
STATE OF ARIZONA
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,)	
)	
Respondent,)	2 CA-CR 2007-0361-PR
)	DEPARTMENT B
v.)	
)	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
)	Not for Publication
JOHN ALLEN REEVES,)	Rule 111, Rules of
)	the Supreme Court
Petitioner.)	
)	

PETITION FOR REVIEW FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PIMA COUNTY

Cause No. CR-17929

Honorable Howard Hantman, Judge

REVIEW GRANTED; RELIEF DENIED

Barbara LaWall, Pima County Attorney
By Jacob R. Lines

Tucson
Attorneys for Respondent

John Allen Reeves

Florence
In Propria Persona

V Á S Q U E Z, Judge.

¶1 Following a jury trial in 1986, petitioner John Allen Reeves was convicted of kidnapping, burglary, and nine counts of sexual assault. *State v. Reves, aka Reeves*, Nos. 2 CA-CR 90-0086, 2 CA-CR 90-0118-PR (consolidated) (memorandum decision filed June 5, 1990). Finding Reeves had committed the offenses while he was on probation, the trial court sentenced him to life imprisonment on each count. On appeal, this court vacated two of the sexual assault convictions, affirmed the rest, and remanded the case for resentencing. We affirmed again when Reeves appealed after being resentenced to life imprisonment on the nine remaining convictions. *State v. Reves, aka Reeves*, No. 2 CA-CR 91-0364 (memorandum decision filed May 19, 1992). In this petition for review, he challenges the trial court’s denial of his latest petition for post-conviction relief filed pursuant to Rule 32, Ariz. R. Crim. P.¹

¶2 We review a trial court’s ruling on a petition for post-conviction relief for an abuse of discretion. *See State v. Watton*, 164 Ariz. 323, 325, 793 P.2d 80, 82 (1990). We find none here. Although Reeves’s arguments are less than clear, to the extent we understand them, it appears the trial court’s order denying relief accurately identified the issues and correctly ruled on them. Because any court in the future can understand the trial

¹From the limited record available to us on review, we are unable to determine the number of previous petitions for post-conviction relief Reeves has filed. However, in its order denying relief, the trial court described them as “numerous,” and Reeves also filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in which he appears to have raised the same or a similar sentencing issue as he does in this current proceeding. The trial court treated that petition as a petition for post-conviction relief, and this court denied relief on review. *Reeves v. State*, 2 CA-HC 2005-0009 (memorandum decision filed Aug. 31, 2006).

court's order, and because the court's findings and conclusions are supported by the record before us, we adopt the court's ruling. *See State v. Whipple*, 177 Ariz. 272, 274, 866 P.2d 1358, 1360 (App. 1993). Accordingly, although we grant review, we deny relief.

GARYE L. VÁSQUEZ, Judge

CONCURRING:

PETER J. ECKERSTROM, Presiding Judge

PHILIP G. ESPINOSA, Judge